

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-24 and 36 are pending in the application, with claim 1 being the independent. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. Support for these changes can be found for example in Fig. 7 and Paragraphs [0070]-[0072] of the specification.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and §103

Claims 1, 3-11, and 16-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Marx et al. U.S. Patent 6,173,266 (Marx). Claims 2 and 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Marx in view of Uppaluru U.S. Patent 5,915,001 (Uppaluru). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Marx does not teach or suggest each and every feature of amended independent claim 1. The Office Action appears to equate the baseline library of Marx to the "repository" limitation of previously presented independent claim 1. The baseline library as shown in Fig. 8 and described at Col. 17 line 6-Col. 18 line 15 of Marx is accessed by a local developer specifying a file path. Marx only discloses the baseline library as a library stored locally on the developer's computer. Thus, Marx does not teach or suggest "invoking in the deployment environment the generic dialog asset from the instance of the remote central repository," as recited in amended independent claim 1.

For at least these reasons, amended independent claim 1 is patentable over Marx. Claims 3-11 and 16-24 depend from claim 1. For at least the above reasons, and further in view of their own features, dependent claims 3-11 and 16-24 are patentable over Marx.

Uppaluru does not overcome the deficiencies of Marx related to independent claim 1. Claims 2 and 12-15 depend from claim 1. For at least this reason and further in view of their own features, claim 1, 2, and 12-15 are patentable over the combination of Marx and Uppaluru. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lori A. Gordon".

Lori A. Gordon
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 50,633

Date: December 5, 2007

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600